

**Exhibit 6**

---

Tatyana Babakaeva  
2124 Criston Dr.  
Newport News, VA 23602  
Phone: (757) 249-3072

June 14, 2010

Mr. Robert P. Quadros, Esq.  
Quadros & Associates, P.C.  
2715 Huntington Ave.  
Newport News, VA 23607

Via first class certified mail

**RE: Wilson & Wilson v. Tatyana A. Babakaeva**  
**Newport News Circuit Court, Case No.: CL0900448V-04**

Dear Mr. Quadros:

I am in receipt of your letter dated June 8, 2010.

As you are or should be aware, you client filed a paper with the federal Court falsely blaming me for a delay with the entry of the final judgment in the above-styled case. You also know that I requested that the Judgment Order be entered immediately.

While in your letter you asserted that you "have revised the Judgment Order", you failed to enclose the purported revised draft Order with your letter. Definitely, there is no legitimate reason for you not to disclose the draft to me at this time. I respectfully request that you immediately endorse the purportedly revised draft Order and send it to me; I also suggest that you file it with the Court. Upon receipt of the purportedly revised draft Order, I will endorse and submit it to the Court for entry (rather than "circulate" it back to you) in order to avoid any further hassles and delays.

For your convenience, I enclose a prepaid self-addressed envelope for the certified USPS first class mail. Please note the USPS tracking number for your mailing containing the purportedly revised draft Order will be 7009 2820 0002 9533 9854 which will be traceable at the USPS Internet site to ensure that it has been actually sent.

Regarding your desire to schedule a Court proceeding in the above-styled caption action, you may or should be aware that the Courts have jurisdiction to decide only controversies between the opposing parties. Your letter does not indicate any controversy except the conflict between your draft Judgment Order attached to your letter dated May 10, 2010 and purportedly revised version of the draft. I am not involved and should not be involved in this conflict between your drafts which is completely within your own domain. You have clear direction of the Court to prepare the draft, and you should follow it. It is completely unnecessary to institute another post-trial pre-judgment proceeding when you could not clearly indicate what the post-trial pre-judgment relief you are seeking. If you do not agree with such my assessment, please provide me with the statutory section, Court Rule and/or any other controlling legal authority which require or allow to seek Court's involvement in resolving your problems.

Your failure to promptly prepare the draft Order, as you were directed by the Court, has already caused unnecessary delay, and your failure has been, and still is, the sole and only cause for the delay. If I do not receive an endorsed revised draft Order within five (5) days upon the date of this letter, it will be clear evidence that your failure to enclose the purported draft Order with your letter was intentional act calculated to cause unnecessary delay, and your attempt to institute unreasonable post-trial post-

judgment proceeding had the purpose to increase the cost of litigation, including court reporting expenses. In such case I will seek appropriate remedies.

Because you indicated that you feel necessary to copy to the Court your correspondence to me, by reason of fairness I am compelled to make the Court aware about my side of the argument.

Thank you for your continuing attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

*Tatyana Babakaeva*

Tatyana Babakaeva

cc: James Shoemaker

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on the 14<sup>th</sup> day of June, 2010 I served by USPS first class prepaid certified mail a true and accurate copy of the foregoing letter with the enclosed envelope on Robert P. Quadros, Esquire, and Raymond B. Bacon, Esquire, Counsel for the Plaintiff, Quadros & Associates, P.C., 2715 Huntington Ave., Newport News, Virginia 23607.